anything? Talk to anyone in response to this letter?

- A. I don't think I did, no.
- Q. Now, in part, this letter addressed you'll see I'm going further down on the first page of this letter, Exhibit 17, that it addresses the concerns, apparently, of the firefighters about any threat with retaliation about implementing an 8-hour shift. You see where it says that?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. Were you familiar with that subject matter at all?
- A. I had heard that. I had heard that, I guess, through the rumor mill, that there was a talk of making changes in the shift work.
- Q. Did you have any conversations or meetings about that possibility of reducing the hours to an 8-hour shift?
 - A. No.
- Q. And that would not have been within your scope of authority as mayor?
 - A. No.
- Q. On the top of page two of Mr. Schaitberger's letter, it refers to local union president Davis, in September of 2005, being issued

a counseling form or reprimand concerning his speaking to the local media. Are you familiar with that subject matter at all?

A. No.

- Q. And then further on in this letter,
 Mr. Schaitberger addresses the rights that public
 employees, including firefighters, have under the
 First Amendment about free speech and free
 association. Are you familiar with those
 principles, that public employees like firefighters
 do have a constitutional right of free speech and
 free association?
 - A. Sure.
- Q. And how long have you been familiar with those principles? Has it been a matter of years?
 - A. Probably early in civics, you know.
 - Q. In high school?
 - A. In high school, yes.
- Q. So when Mr. Schaitberger addressed these principles about the First Amendment rights of Mr. Davis or public employees, it didn't come as a shock or a surprise to you, did it?
- A. No. I think he's reiterating what we already know, that all people have a right to free speech.

- Q. All right. Let's move on to a different subject, which would have been, as I understand it, a telephone call that was initiated by Mr. Davis to you, as mayor of the city, in April of 2006. And I want to invite your attention, so we have accurate testimony from you, to Exhibit 21. And if you could please identify what this document is?
- A. It's a message, just a memo that I received from the secretary, Camara, like I receive several a day.
 - Q. Camara, how is that spelled?
 - A. C-A-M-A-R-A.
 - Q. Is that your secretary?
- A. Actually, she acts as secretary for both the city manager and myself.
- Q. And is it your understanding that she filled out and wrote this message?
 - A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

74

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And what is the date that it shows?
- A. 4/17.
 - Q. And that would have been the year 2006?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And it's partially blocked off there, but it looks like 12:30 or something?
 - A. Yes.

Is that a fair statement? Would it just 7 0. have been after the noon hour on that date, after the noon hour? 3 Yes, sir. A. 4 And it shows the phone number of Mr. Davis? 0. 5 Uh-huh. A. 6 And can you read for us what the brief 7 0. message is there? 8 A. City proposals. He would not speak with 9 anyone else. 10 And do you remember receiving that message 11 from Camara on that date? 12 I -- not specifically this message, but I 13 receive messages every day. But, yes, I do remember receiving this message and returning the phone call. Q. Okay. And when you say you returned the phone call, did you, in fact, get Mr. Davis on the phone when you tried to reach him back? A. I think I did. I think I did the first time, if I'm not mistaken. I'm not real sure, but I think I did. Move on to Exhibit 22. And this is a statement apparently from a Mr. David Davis and signed by him, and you see at the top there it bears

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the date of April 19, 2006, which would have been

just two days after the phone conversation that you had with Mr. Davis.

A. Uh-huh.

- Q. And it's fairly short, so let me quote it.

 It's addressed to Wallace Hunter, Fire Chief of the city. It says, quote, on Monday, April 17, 2006, I placed a call to Mayor Jeff Hardin's office. As president of the Phenix City Firefighters'

 Association Local 3668, I made this call in regards to some labor issues in which I had concerns with.

 Mayor Hardin returned my call later that evening, and we discussed the issues which I wanted to address, end quote. You see where it says that?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. As far as you know, is that an accurate statement of Mr. Davis?
- A. It is. With regards to as president of the Phenix City Firefighters' Association, that was that was something that's put in this letter. You know, my message, you know, to him was to call David Davis. We sent a letter to the association that all the correspondence through the association should go through the city manager. Actually, the city council sent a letter to the association with all of our agreeance unanimously agreed to all any

association issues would be taken up with the city manager. So, basically, he would be our spokesperson.

-

- Q. When you returned the call to Mr. Davis on the evening, apparently, of April 17, 2006, what were the issue or issues that Mr. Davis discussed with you in that telephone conversation?
- A. It was about the ordinance that we were going to pass to change the probationary time for employees of public safety.
- Q. And did Mr. Davis, in that telephone conversation with you, express concerns that he and other firefighters had about that particular proposed ordinance?
- A. I don't remember how he worded it, but he did say he had concern. I don't know if they were his concerns or that he said there were other concerns, but he said that there were some concerns about the changing of the probationary time.
- Q. And what concerns did he express on behalf of himself and the other members?
- A. He didn't like the fact that the probationary time was going to be extended.
 - Q. Did he say why?
 - A. I -- I don't recall, but he didn't like the

fact that it was going to be extended.

1.8

- Q. Did he express concerns that that might have an adverse impact on recruitment of new firefighters into the department or perhaps an adverse impact on employee morale in the fire department?
- A. I don't know the specific reasons why he had a problem with it, but he just said that -- my conversation, what I understood, he just didn't like the fact that it was going to be extended.
- Q. But you don't recall right now reasons that he gave to you on behalf of himself and the members about extending the probationary period?
- A. I don't remember exactly what he said about -- I know that his issue was with, specifically, the extension of the probationary period.
- Q. And was there, in fact, a proposed ordinance that was coming before the city council on that matter?
- A. Yes. Actually coming up for a final vote. We had actually already placed it on the -- if I remember correctly, we had already placed it on first reading, and it was going to a final vote.
 - Q. And who within the city had proposed that

new policy or new ordinance?

- A. The city manager brought it to the city council, but it was recommended to us -- it was recommended by the police chief, the fire chief, and the city manager.
- Q. Was that going to be a new policy applicable to the police department as well?
 - A. Yes.

Townson or the last

- Q. And what was the underlying reasons or rationale for the fire department and the police department and the city manager to propose that extension of the probationary period?
- A. And that was the question, of course, we asked as a council. And we were told that basically what happens is the training period is so long for both police and firemen, that there was not an ample opportunity for the employee to come to work and be evaluated within that probationary period that was on the books at that time. So they felt both the police and the fire chief and city manager felt like extending that would allow both the employee and the leadership in both of those departments at the time to get a true evaluation of what the job is physically within the constraints of the job and not just within training. So we thought that was a

reasonable explanation of why they wanted that done and that's why we passed it.

- Q. So it was passed and it was implemented?
- A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. Then returning to the telephone conversation you had with Mr. Davis on April 17, do you recall anything else that was discussed by you or by Mr. Davis in that telephone discussion?
- A. I don't recall anything. I just remember the -- kind of the reason for the call was to express his concerns about extending the -- and I actually think he made a recommendation. I don't remember what that was, but I think he recommended something different than we had proposed.
- Q. Did he recommend or submit a proposal to you in that telephone conversation to keep the probationary period the same or to change it to some other period of time?
- A. I think his proposal was to change it to some other period of time.
 - Q. Do you remember what period that was?
- A. I don't -- it had something to do with -- if I recall correctly, it had something to do with the amount -- after the amount of training when that person is put in place. Instead of going to a set

amount of time, which I don't remember the specifics, I think it — but his was, you know, to change — if I'm not mistaken, it was to change based on — it was something different between what we had on the books and what we were proposing. It was something different than that.

- Q. But you don't remember precisely?
- A. I don't remember precisely.
- Q. But this policy change that was implemented extending the probationary period in the fire and police departments from one year to 18 months, that solely applied to new hires into those departments; is that your understanding?
 - A. That's what we understood, yes, sir.
- Q. So that change in the probationary period would have had no application to veteran firefighters who had been working for the fire department for a period of years?
- A. No, sir. And those questions were brought up.
 - Q. At the council meeting?
 - A. Yes.

1

2

3

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

- Q. And could you elaborate on that, please?
- A. Just that that was asked; you know, who does this apply to. And, of course, the ordinance

spelled it out, but sometimes there's a lot of legalese in there, so you want to make sure, in layman's terms, you understand exactly what it says. So I know that that was brought up at the meeting. Someone asked that question.

- Q. So that new policy or ordinance of the city extending the probationary period would not have had any application to David Davis being a veteran employee of the fire department, correct?
 - A. No, sir, not as we understood it.
- Q. It would not have applied to him as an employee?
 - A. Correct.

- Q. So is it fair and accurate to say that in your telephone conversation with Mr. Davis on April 17, 2006, he was not raising this issue of extending the probationary period because he had any individual grievance or employee concern because it didn't apply to him; is that a fair statement?
- A. I don't know if he -- because I remember talking with him, and I don't know if he completely understood what the ordinance said. I think there were some questions as to what the ordinance actually applied to, and if it applied to -- because I remember him asking some questions about the

ordinance and it was not — if I remember correctly, it was not a long conversation, but it was — I think there were some questions about it, you know. I think when it was going to come up or, you know, what it applied to.

- Q. But in terms of the scope or application of extending the probationary period, just so the record here is clear, it was your understanding and the understanding of the city council that it would have no application to veteran employees of the fire department, correct?
 - A. I think --

James .

- Q. It applied only to new hires?
- A. If I'm not mistaken, it applied to new employees, and I think if there was a new job title or new job promotion, that it applied to those employees also, if I remember correctly. It's been a long time since I read well, I didn't go over that ordinance before our meeting, so I don't exactly remember that it says.
- Q. In the past at city council meetings, have employees of the city appeared before the city council to express their position or concerns on issues?
 - A. No.

Q.	You	ı dor	ı't	re	memk	er	any	time	that	an
employee	of	the	cit	У	has	con	ne b	efore	the	city
council?										

- A. Yes. There's been times where employees have during my previous council, we had an employee that came in front of the city. And then we also had if I'm not mistaken, during my previous council term, there was some kind of either public hearing or something where we had a group of firefighters at a meeting. I don't know if it was a work session or public hearing or council meeting, but there was a group of firemen at the meeting. I don't really remember the whole conversation or why they were there, but I remember —
- Q. And that was when you were a city council member?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. Do you remember what the subject matter was that was raised by the firefighters?
- A. I do not. I don't remember specifics, but remember a group of firefighters being there.
- Q. And after that meeting with a group of firefighters and the city council, do you know if any other firefighters were disciplined in any way for appearing before the city council?

1	A. I don't know. I mean, I wouldn't know
2	that.
3	Q. Mr. Mayor, let me invite your attention to
4	Exhibit Number 23. And this appears to be a
5	memorandum from Fire Chief Wallace Hunter addressed
6	to the City Manager, H.H. Roberts, dated April 20,
7	2006. It shows a copy being sent to Barbara
8	Goodwin, the Personnel Director of the city, and the
9	re line indicates Sergeant David Davis, Merit System
10	and SOP violations. Have you ever seen this memo
11	before today?
12	A. No.
13	Q. Okay. Why don't you read that completely
14	to yourself? It's fairly short.
15	MR. WOODLEY: In the meantime, why don't we
16	take a five-minute break. Does that sound
17	good?
18	MR. GRAHAM: Yes.
19	(Brief recess.)
20	MR. WOODLEY: Back on the record.
21	Q. Mr. Mayor, I think just before we took this
22	brief break, I was inviting your attention to
23	Exhibit Number 23 in front of you and, once again,
24	this is a memo from Fire Chief Hunter to City

Manager Roberts dated April 20, 2006, a copy going

24

to the Personnel Director, Ms. Goodwin. And you've had an opportunity to carefully and fully read this document, correct?

- A. I have, yes, sir.
- Q. And have you seen this particular document before today?
 - A. No.

- Q. Let me invite your attention to a couple of statements in this memorandum. In the very first paragraph, first sentence, it says, quote, this memo is to inform you about a conversation between Personnel Director Barbara Goodwin and myself about the city's new probation time for new hires for Public Safety, end quote. You see where it says that?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Once again, so it's at least clear in my mind, that new policy applied to new hires for Public Safety. Is that accurate?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Then further down in this document, the third paragraph says, quote, David Davis has made it clear that he will not adhere to our merit system grievance process or the department and city Standard Operating Procedures. Then it goes on to

say — addressing you — Mayor Hardin should refer any employee violating the chain of command, as indicated in our merit system, back to their department head, personnel department, or city manager. Failing to do so is a violation of our city charter, end quote. See where it says that?

A. I do.

- Q. It sounds to me like Chief Hunter is telling City Manager Roberts and Ms. Goodwin that you have violated the city charter. Do you have a reaction to that?
- A. You know, first of all, I don't think that Chief Hunter is an attorney, so his interpretation of the charter is, you know, I guess like anybody else, you can read it and get an interpretation that you want. I don't -- you know, I don't really have -- like I say, I'm just surprised to read this.
- Q. Would you agree with his statement that your communication on the telephone with Mr. Davis about the probationary period policy was a violation of the city charter by you?
 - A. No.
 - Q. You don't agree with that?
 - A. No.
 - Q. When you say you don't agree with that,

could you please tell me why you don't agree with it?

. 9

1.8

A. Well, the conversation — the charter is very specific in what it states. The charter is not set up to where the mayor or council members can not talk to city employees. I mean, that's ridiculous. The interpretation is ridiculous, to even think that.

The charter is set up to where the mayor and the city council does not order or direct employees to any action. There's a specific line between the day-to-day operations of what the city manager and the department head's duties are versus what the city council's duties are. So the charter — the intent of that portion of the charter that I'm assuming that this is — it doesn't have anything to do — you know, if that's the case, there would be no communication whatsoever — hello, how are you doing, how was your birthday or your Christmas — there would be no communication whatsoever, because that could be perceived as communication between employees and council.

Q. As the mayor, do you believe that it's consistent with your rights and responsibilities to have conversations with city employees about issues

that affect the city or the operations of certain departments?

- A. You said do you think it's my right? Is that what you said?
- Q. Yes. Let me rephrase the question so it's clear. You indicated earlier that you have an open door policy, and you appear to me to be an individual that's willing to communicate with people, and it's part of your job as mayor.

Do you feel like you're prohibited and barred from discussing with city employees issues or policies that affect the city or the department in which the employee happens to work?

A. I think, for the proper operation of the city, that I don't need to get involved. I think there is a — at some point, there may be a misunderstanding of who you work for if you get involved in the day—to—day operations. So, you know, the fact that you listen to what people have to say is different than acting upon it or how you carry that out. You know, as a matter of fact, it says in that letter here that things should be reported to the department head or personnel department or the city manager. You know, my conversations are not with department heads or the

personnel director; they are with the city manager. So there's a misunderstanding there. But I think that in my position, you have to listen to all people. It's just a matter of what you do with that information. And typically what I do is try to go — to sort out and try to determine on my own what is relevant, and then carry the relevant information to the city manager.

- Q. Is it fair and accurate to say in your job and position as a city mayor, that you're looking to collect information, whether it's from city employees, about issues affecting a department or other subjects so that you can better do a job as mayor in collecting that information and doing your duties?
- A. Well, that's what we have to do, to do an effective job, yes.
- Q. Later on in this memo -- again, Exhibit 23, the memo from Mr. Hunter to Mr. Roberts -- at the end on page two it says, quote, I also feel very strongly that someone should speak with Mayor Hardin about this sensitive issue of interfering with the jobs that department heads are trying to do to keep their departments running smoothly and effectively, end quote. You see where it says that?

- 1 .
- 2 .
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13 14
- ****
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18 19
- 20
- 21 -
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

- A. Very clearly.
- Q. Did you feel like that your conversation on the telephone with Mr. Davis on April 17, 2006, was an interference with the fire department operations?
 - A. I do not.
- Q. And why do you say you do not agree with that?
- A. You know, I guess what do you do with that information if you if I heard and listened to what was said, you know, the interference would go in if I went into the fire department and tried to change the way they did business, or met with the chief and tried to change their recommendation from the probationary time. That would be an interference.

And I don't -- you know, I don't think, you know, listening to what someone has to say that you are interfering with the job that the department heads are trying to do. So, you know, from my standpoint, I heard exactly what was said and -- but I didn't interfere with the department head or what the chief was trying to do in his department.

Q. So in other words, the telephone conversation you had with Mr. Davis on April 17, 2006, in which he evidently expressed concerns about